

## ***Remarks***

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 23 are currently amended. Claims 25-28 are added. No claims are cancelled. No new subject matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

### ***Objections to the Drawings***

Although the Examiner does not expressly object to the drawings in the Detailed Action, Replacement drawings addressing the issues raised in the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review attached to the Office Action are being prepared, and will be filed shortly.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. These rejections are moot in light of the amendments set forth above.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 7-9, 12-15, 18-21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Szymanski *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,337). Applicant traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, a network that provides unified communications services to subscribers that enable the subscribers to share information, the unified communications services comprising application processes. Independent claims 7, 13, and 19 include similar recitations, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a number of application processes may be combined over a network to provide uniform communications services. For example,

the application processes may include router processes, database processes, and other processes (see the Specification at page 4, lines 15-21). The operation of an application process may raise an associated event, which may trigger a notification to a subscriber (see the Specification at page 5, lines 5-7). Event filters may be used to notify an event manager of events on the network by passing notifications of events to the event manager over the network (see the Specification at page 5, line 17-page 6, line 6). The event manager then disposes of the event notifications (see the Specification at page 6, lines 6-9).

Szymanski appears to be drawn to a method and apparatus for distributing information about events occurring in a computer (see Szymanski at col. 1, lines 16-20). Szymanski discloses that the method and apparatus are designed specifically to address the need for efficient communications between different entities within a single computer (see Szymanski at col. 3, lines 54-59). Therefore, Szymanski does not disclose a network that provides unified communications services to subscribers that enable the subscribers to share information, the unified communications services comprising application processes.

Accordingly independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are allowable over the cited reference. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, and 24 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, and are allowable over Szymanski based on their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Szymanski in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,925,108). These rejections are traversed on the following grounds.

The Examiner admits that Szymanski fails to disclose a registration manager, but alleges that Johnson teaches a registration manager that manages the registration of the plurality of notification handlers (see the Office Action at page 6, paragraphs 16a and 16b). Johnson apparently discloses event or message notification management in

a computer system (see Johnson at col. 1, lines 25 and 26). However, Johnson does not teach or suggest modifying Szymanski to remedy the deficiencies of Szymanski discussed above. In particular, there is no motivation to combine Szymanski with Johnson to create a network of computers because Szymanski explicitly teaches away from modifications involving more than one computer. Therefore, even if Examiner's allegation with respect to Johnson is accepted, claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 are distinguishable over the cited references at least because the combination of Szymanski and Johnson fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Szymanski and Johnson, in view of Woodring *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,686). These rejections are traversed on the following grounds.

The Examiner admits that Szymanski and Johnson fail to disclose the use of a shared memory, but alleges that Woodring teaches using a shared memory (see the Office Action at page 8, paragraphs 21d and 21e). Woodring apparently discloses information streaming in a multi-process system using shared memory. However, Woodring does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Szymanski and Johnson discussed above. Therefore, even if Examiner's allegation with respect to Woodring is accepted, claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 are distinguishable over the cited references at least because the combination of Szymanski, Johnson, and Woodring fail to provide the features of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

### ***Newly Added Claims***

Claims 25-28 are newly added and are drawn to subject matter included in the Specification and Drawings as originally filed, but not previously claimed. Claims 25-28 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, and are allowable over the cited references based on their dependency, as well as the features that they add to the independent claims.


Customer Number  
00909

Application Serial No.: 10/041,570  
Attorney Docket No.: 042846-0312833  
Reply and Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: March 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean L. Ingram", written over a horizontal line.

Sean L. Ingram  
Registration No.: 48,283  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
1600 Tysons Blvd.  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
703-905-2000